

REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the final Office Action mailed July 10, 2008 ("Office Action"). Claims 1-27 were pending in the Application. In the Office Action, Claims 1-27 were rejected. Claims 1, 5-6, 13-14, 18-19, 23 and 26-27 have been amended. In particular, independent Claims 1, 13 and 23 have been amended to incorporate subject matter from original Claims 8-10, 20-22 and 24, which have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Further support for the amendments can be found in at least paragraph [0074] of the originally-filed Application. Thus, Claims 1-7, 11-19, 23 and 25-27 remain pending in the Application. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

In the Office Action, the following actions were taken or matters were raised:

SECTION 103 REJECTIONS

Claims 1, 4, 13, 19 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,202,211 to Williams, Jr. (hereinafter "*Williams Jr.*") in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0048757 to Accarie, et al. (hereinafter "*Accarie*") in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0049797 to Salmonsén (hereinafter "*Salmonsén*"). Claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 11, 12, 14-18 and 25-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Williams Jr.* in view of *Accarie* in view of *Salmonsén* and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0056118 to Hunter, et al. (hereinafter "*Hunter*"). Claims 8, 9, 10, 20-22 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Williams Jr.* in view of *Accarie* in view of *Salmonsén* and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0019908 to Williams, et al. (hereinafter "*Williams*"). In light of the amendment to claims as noted below, Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Of the rejected claims, Claims 1, 13 and 23 are independent. Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate subject matter from Claim 10, which has now been canceled. As amended, Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, the sink component is configured to "present to a user a filtered aggregated listing of the A/V program data available from each of the plurality of source components based on a type of the presentation device" (emphasis added). On page 14 of the Office Action, the Examiner appears to acknowledge with regard to Claim 10 that *Williams, Jr.*, *Accarie*, and *Salmonsén* fail to teach or even suggest an aggregated listing of the A/V program data available from each of the plurality of source components based on a type of the

presentation device. The Applicant agrees. However, on page 15 of the Office Action the Examiner asserts that *Williams* overcomes this deficiency because the audio data depicted in Fig. 5 of *Williams* will be reproduced on an audio presenter, namely the speaker system of Fig. 1 of *Williams*. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

In paragraph [0037], *Williams* states:

Channel selection controller 208 controls the surfing through a user-definable preferences list(s) of the present invention. Channel selection controller 208 includes channel selector 221 and preferences control 222. Preferences control 222 interacts with preferences database 214 to allow a user to access and modify the stored preferences. When a user requests to be provided with a new channel, channel selector 221 accesses preferences database 214 and determines the next channel to be provided to the user.

(emphasis added).

Likewise, in paragraph [0045], *Williams* states:

Returning to FIG. 3, once the appropriate preferences list is identified in step 304, channel selector 221 of FIG. 2 accesses the identified preferences list, step 306. Based on the information within the accessed preferences list, channel selector 221 determines the next channel, step 308.

(emphasis added).

Finally, in paragraph [0048], *Williams* states:

An example EPG database is illustrated in FIG. 5. As illustrated, database 500 includes channel identifiers 502, tuning component identifiers 504, and source descriptors 506. Additional information (e.g., show times, show description information such as title and actors/actresses, etc.) is also included in database 500 (but is not shown). Channel selection controller 208 of FIG. 2 can access EPG database 500 and search the channel identifiers 502 for the determined channel (from step 308 of FIG. 3).

(emphasis added).

Based on the foregoing, Applicant submits that *Williams* appears to allow a user to establish a preference list of channels. Once the preference list of *Williams* is established, the "next channel" encountered by the user while "channel surfing" is determined by consulting the previously established preference list. In Fig. 5 of *Williams*, the user appears to be presented with, if anything, those channels that have been culled from the EPG database based on the preference list as well as some information pertaining to those channels.

In contrast to the above, Claim 1 includes the limitation of "a filtered aggregated listing of the A/V program data available from each of the plurality of source components based on a type of the presentation device" (emphasis added). The Examiner has not pointed out, and Applicant is unable to locate, any teaching or even suggestion in *Williams* of a filtered aggregated listing of A/V program data based on a type of the presentation device. Indeed, Applicant submits the channels depicted in Fig. 5 of *Williams* are based upon the user-defined preference list and not based on a type of the presentation device as recited in Claim 1. For at least this reason, Applicant requests that the rejection of Claim 1 be withdrawn and the claim allowed to issue.

As amended, Claim 13 recites, *inter alia*, "presenting to the user a filtered aggregated listing of the A/V program data available from each of the plurality of source components based on a type of the presentation device" (emphasis added). In addition, amended Claim 23 recites, *inter alia*, "means for presenting to the user an aggregated listing of the A/V program data available from each of the plurality of source components based on a type of the presentation device" (emphasis added). For the reasons noted above for Claim 1, Applicant submits that *Williams, Jr., Accarie, Salmonsens, and Williams*, either alone or in combination, do not appear to teach or even suggest this limitation. For at least this reason, Applicant requests that the rejection of Claims 13 and 23 be withdrawn and the claims allowed to issue.

As noted above Claims 8-10, 20-22 and 24 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Therefore, the rejection of Claims 8-10, 20-22 and 24 is now moot and should be withdrawn.

Each of Claims 2-7, 11-12, 14-19 and 25-27, either directly or through intervening claims, depends from and includes all the base limitations of independent Claims 1, 13 and 23, respectively. As such, each of Claims 2-7, 11-12, 14-19 and 25-27 is believed to be patentable

for at least the reasons noted above for Claims 1, 13 and 23. Therefore, the rejection of Claims 2-7, 11-12, 14-19 and 25-27 should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Applicant has made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for immediate allowance. For the foregoing reasons and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and full allowance of all pending claims.

An RCE filing fee of \$810.00 is believed due. The Director of Patents and Trademarks is hereby authorized to charge the amount of \$810.00 to satisfy the RCE filing fee to Deposit Account No. 08-2025 of Hewlett-Packard Company. If, however, Applicant has miscalculated the fee due with this RCE, the Director is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayment associated with this RCE to Deposit Account No. 08-2025 of Hewlett-Packard Company.

Respectfully submitted,

/James L. Baudino/

James L. Baudino

Registration No. 43,486

Date: **October 10, 2008**

Hewlett-Packard Company
Legal Department – MS 4059
19483 Pruneridge Avenue
Cupertino, CA 95014-0604
(408) 447-0289